

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

2

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                            | FILING DATE     | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.      | CONFIRMATION NO. |  |
|--|-----------------|----------------------|--------------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/063,826                                 | 05/16/2002      | Paul E. Licato       | 122261                   | 6255             |  |
| 23413                                      | 7590 04/06/2005 |                      | EXAMINER                 |                  |  |
| CANTOR COLBURN, LLP                        |                 |                      | SHEARIN, ANDREW J        |                  |  |
| 55 GRIFFIN ROAD SOUTH BLOOMFIELD, CT 06002 |                 |                      | ART UNIT                 | PAPER NUMBER     |  |
|  | ·               |                      | 3737                     | 3737             |  |
|  |                 |                      | DATE MAIL ED: 04/06/2005 |                  |  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|   |  | ント   |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|   | Application No.  | Applicant(s)   |  |  |  |  |
| Office A - 41 Occurrence  | 10/063,826   | LICATO ET AL.  |  |  |  |  |
| Office Action Summary   | Examiner   | Art Unit   |  |  |  |  |
|   | Andrew Shearin   | 3737   |  |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app<br>Period for Reply  | ears on the cover sheet with the c   | orrespondence address  |  |  |  |  |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).          | 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timed within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day, will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE | ely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. & 133) |  |  |  |  |
| Status  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 M   | av 2002.   |  |  |  |  |  |
| · _   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <i>,</i> —  | <del>_</del>   |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Disposition of Claims   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>4)  Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.</li> <li>4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw</li> <li>5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed.</li> <li>6)  Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.</li> <li>7)  Claim(s) 3,17-32 and 35 is/are objected to.</li> <li>8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or</li> </ul>  | vn from consideration.   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Application Papers  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examine  | r.   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce   | epted or b) objected to by the E   | Examiner.  |  |  |  |  |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the   | drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See  | 37 CFR 1.85(a).  |  |  |  |  |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex  | aminer. Note the attached Office   | Action or form PTO-152.  |  |  |  |  |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul> |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Attachment(s)   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 4) Interview Summary<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Da  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5/29/02</u> .  |  | te<br>atent Application (PTO-152)  |  |  |  |  |

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

1. Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 34 claims a signal, which does not encompass any of the statutory categories of invention. The method of claim 34 is intended use.

### Claim Objections

- 2. Claims 17-32 and 35 are objected to because of the following informalities: the scope of claim 17 appears to be a system for use in an MRI system followed by a limitation that encompasses an entire MRI system, a preamble followed by a limitation that broadens the scope; claim 35 has improper use of means plus function language. Appropriate correction is required.
- 3. Claim 3 is objected to because of lack of antecedent basis in the claims for 'said calculating'. Claim 1 makes no claim to calculating.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Application/Control Number: 10/063,826 Page 3

Art Unit: 3737

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-33 and 35-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dumoulin (6198282) in view of Miyazaki et al. (6320377). Dumoulin '282 teaches: the use of area in determining amplitude and slew rate, which is used to determine pulse length (Dumoulin '282 col. 8, lines 30-38, col. 7, lines 1-4, and col. 8, lines 30-48); that when the gradient amplifier must make an amplitude gradient pulse having an area greater than that of the largest triangular pulse, the gradient pulse with optimal duration becomes a trapezoid (Dumoulin '282 col. 2, lines 43-46); and the use of a CPU and a system control (Dumoulin '282 col. 6, lines 61-67 - it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to use a program to control the timing of MRI pulses, especially since most MRI gradient pulses are only microseconds in length). Dumoulin does not explicitly teach the use of nested pulses or multiple sequences. Miyazaki et al. '377 teaches the use of nested pulses and multiple pulse sequences (Miyazaki et al. '377 col. 13, lines 59-62) in a MRI system for fast FLAIR sequencing which achieves the same end result as the applicant. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Dumoulin '282 with Miyazaki et al. '377 in order to create a physiologically sensitive fast scan MRI system (Miyazaki et al. '377 col. 13, lines 41-47).

#### Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew Shearin whose telephone number is (571)272-4744. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-5:00 M-F.

Art Unit: 3737

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Casler can be reached on (571)272-4956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AS

BRIAN L. CASLER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700